

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-20, 22-36 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 14, 23 and 31 have been amended while claim 37 has been canceled in this response. Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Salomon and Examiner Hong for the teleconference of September 27, 2007. The merits of the claims vis-à-vis the cited references were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-7, 12-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25, 28-31, 33 and 36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 12-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25, 28-31, 33 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Scully, *et al.* (U.S. 4,831,552) in view of Kim *et al.* (U.S. 2002/0065701). Applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scully, *et al.* and Kim *et al.* alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest all features set forth in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, ***the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.*** See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The subject claims are directed towards a computer executable system and method for generation of documents such as meeting preparation reports that compiles information about the meeting including information about the recipients based on social relationships that is helpful in preparing for the meeting. The system creates an event document wherein event information is structured according to one or more of a company organizational chart or grouped according to

functions. To this end, independent claims 1 recites that *attendee profiles are arranged by decreasing organizational chart distance from the user*. Independent claims 14, 23 and 31 recite similar features. Scully, *et al.* and Kim *et al.* either alone or in combination fail to disclose such novel features.

Scully, *et al.* relates to an electronic calendaring method for assisting a calendar owner to request the system to develop and display a composite calendar comprising entries from a plurality of calendars within a specified time span, which has been selected by criteria entered interactively into the system by the calendar owner. At the cited portion Scully, *et al.* teaches how a department manager would coordinate the electronic calendars of all the twelve members of his departments to schedule a meeting. As conceded by the Examiner on page 3 of the Final Office Action, Scully *et al.* does not disclose arranging event information within an event document based on various formats such as an organization structure or a roundtable format *etc.*

Kim *et al.* relates to a system and a method for automating a business process, and a utility device that can help design and implement a business decision-making procedure and workflow automation. At the cited portions, Kim *et al.* discloses an administrator that maintains the organization and its member information. An organization manager creates and maintains an organization chart that is utilized in the automation of a business process, where the allocation of roles in the process is based on the chart. The chart stores relationships between departments, members of the departments, their ranks and member information. Thus, the organization chart represents all the departments and members of the company, where the members and departments are ranked. However, Kim *et al.* does not teach personalizing an organizational chart to a user let alone teach or suggest generating a meeting document specific to a user as recited in the subject claims.

By employing the format such as that recited in the subject claims, the claimed invention leverages the power of social network analysis to help a user quickly prepare for a meeting by generating a meeting document structured in accordance with various social criteria associated with the event attendees. For example, the event document may arrange attendee profiles based on an organizational chart distance of the attendees from a user who prints the event document hence the attendees who may be familiar to the user are printed lower as compared to those who may be unfamiliar. This facilitates a user to prepare for a meeting by quickly scanning the event

document for unfamiliar attendees. Such novel aspects are not taught or suggested by Scully, *et al* and Kim *et al*.

In view of at least the aforementioned, it can be concluded that Scully, *et al*. and Kim *et al*., alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest an identical invention as recited in the subject claims. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Scully *et al*. in view of Kim *et al*. and in further view of Holtz *et al*. (U.S. 2003/0001880). Applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scully, *et al*., Kim *et al*. and Holtz *et al*. either alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature set forth in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to generating an event document that summarizes topics of a meeting or event, the attendees, how the attendees relate, their motivations, and what the attendees may be looking for from the meeting. The report can be formatted to structure event information to a specific user. The subject claims depend from independent claim 1. As stated *supra*, Scully, *et al*. and Kim *et al*. fail to describe all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Holtz *et al*. relates to a system for producing and distributing enhanced media, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 17, 24, 27, 32 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4, 5, 17, 24, 27, 32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully *et al*. in view of Kim *et al*. and in further view of Doss (US 2003/0046296 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to generating an event document that summarizes topics of a meeting or event, the attendees, how the attendees relate, their motivations, and what the attendees may be looking for from the meeting. The report can be formatted to structure event information in a manner specific to a user. The subject claims depend from independent

claims 1, 14, 23 and 31. As stated *supra*, Scully, *et al.* and Kim *et al.* fail to describe all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Doss relates to providing dynamic contact information to instant messaging (IM) systems and electronic status boards and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency with respect to independent claims 1, 14, 23 and 31. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 8, 18, 26 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8, 18, 26 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully, *et al.* and Kim *et al.* and further in view of Estrada (US 7,012,627 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to generation of documents such as meeting preparation reports that compiles information about the meeting including information about the recipients based on social relationships that is helpful in preparing for the meeting. The report can be formatted to structure event information customized to a particular user. The subject claims depend from independent claims 1, 14 and 31. As stated *supra*, Scully, *et al.* and Kim *et al.* fail to describe all aspects set forth in the subject independent claims. Estrada relates to providing an improved visual display for rooms in collaboration space displayed at a user browser and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Scully, *et al.* and Kim *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1, 14 and 31. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP658US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731